

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.]]	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/768,720		01/30/2004	Reinhold Winkler	22773	22773 5117		
535	7590	03/28/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
		RL F ROSS	RAO, G N	RAO, G NAGESH			
5676 RIVER PO BOX 90		VENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
RIVERDAL	E (BRO)	NX), NY 10471-090	. 1722				

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Cumment	10/768,720	WINKLER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	G. Nagesh Rao	1722			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	·				
Application Papers	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original transfer of or the original transfer of the original transfer of the original transfer or the origina	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/768,720 Page 2

Art Unit: 1722

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 1. Claims 1-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cotteverte (US Patent No. 6,523,997 B1) in view of Gale (US Patent No. 4,857,250).

Please note the material worked upon in the apparatus is seen as a recitation of intended use and bears no weight to the capability of the apparatus.

Cotteverte 997 teaches an apparatus as shown in Figure 1 with a housing (11) enclosing two extrusion worms (1, 2). The extrusion worms are connected to a

pair of driving shafts (3,4) synced with a pair of receiving shafts (25,26) anticipates as types of stators and having a set of teeth (27,28) and operated by a driving means.

Cotteverte 997 fails to specifically teach the use of a drive motor for operating the extrusion worms.

In a method of extrusion, Gale 250 teaches the use of a stator (Fig 1 Element 20) and rotor (Fig 1 Element 22) affixed to an extruder aiding in its rotation operation as it is driven by an AC motor (Col 10 Lines 41-56).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the device shown by

Cotteverte 997 with the motor of Gale 250 for automated processing of the device
resulting in faster processing time. Furthermore the use of one drive motor would
be sufficient for carrying out the necessary job and allowing cost reduction of parts
by using one motor rather than multiple motors for operating the device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to G. Nagesh Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2946. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin Utech can be reached on (571) 272-1137. The

Application/Control Number: 10/768,720 Page 4

Art Unit: 1722

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GNR

BENJAMIN L. HTECH
SUPERVISORY PATENT CHAMINER
TECHNOLOGY DENJER 1700